DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 460 CG 009 157

AUTHOR	Jensen, Gary F.
TITLE	Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women in Prison.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[73]
NOTE	33p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Corrective Institutions; *Females; *Institutionalized (Persons); *Prisoners; Research Projects; Sex Differences; Subculture

ABSTRACT

This study explores a range of issues characterizing prisonization research based on male populations but does so utilizing cross-sectional questionnaire data gathered from 172 female felons and misdemeanants incarcerated in a prison for women in the southeastern United States. The analysis concentrates on three major issues: (1) the relation of traditional "situational" variables (career phase and group contact) to inmate perspectives, (2) the relative impact of situational versus "imported" characteristics on inmate perspectives, and (3) the relevance of labeling theory notions of retributive justice to prisonization research. In general, it was found that the patterns involving career phase and group contact were similar to those typically found among males and similar to the most recent analysis among females. Moreover, of all situational variables examined the traditional situational variables were the most strongly related to inmate perspectives. On the other hand, the background variables, age and felony status, were more strongly related than situational variables. Finally, career phase and group contact were more strongly related in some categories of inmates than in others and the pattern of "interaction" found seems to have been anticipated by labeling theorists. This latter set of findings suggests that prisonization models might be "specified" by drawing on notions of retributive justice. (Author)

ED 095460

Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women In Prison*

Gary F. Jensen
Department of Sociology
University of Arizona, Tucson

*The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Dorothy Jones (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) without whom this data would not have been collected. The research was supported by funds from a National Science Foundation faculty development grant at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

CG 009 157

Introduction

The sociological study of prisons and prisoners in the United States has been confined primarily to male inmates. Thus, while there is a long tradition of quantitative research on the "prisonization" of males there are only a few studies relevant to similar issues among females. In fact, since the two major works in the mid-60's (Ward and Kassenbaum 1965; Giallombardo 1966) there has been only one subsequent analysis of female inmates and that study dealt with both voluntarily as well as involuntarily committed narcotic addicts (Tittle 1969:492-505). Moreover, studies of women in prison have tended to focus on homosexuality and its relation to inmate social organization such that we know very little concerning issues which are central to recent research on males (Schwartz 1971:532-542; Wheeler 1971:1005-1022; Thomas and Foster 1972:229-239). This study, then, attempts to add to our body of knowledge concerning prisonization by examining traditional and current issues characterizing the study of male inmates utilizing data collected from female felons and misdemeanants incarcerated in a correctional center for women in the southeastern United States.

Situational and Diffusionist Models

Two interrelated topics have dominated much of the sociological literature on the prison community: (1) the emergence of an "inmate culture" or, more specifically, an "inmate code" prescribing behavior and attitudes in conflict with "offical norms" and (2) the assimilation of such a culture within the prison context. A common tendency in most classic analyses approaching these topics has been to attribute inmate culture and variable embracement of norms in conflict with authority to

experiences associated with imprisonment itself. Thus, a popular view of inmate society has been that an inmate code emerges as a collective adaptation to the deprivations or "pains of imprisonment" and is learned and perpetuated primarily through interaction with other inmates (Sykes 1958; Sykes and Messinger 1960:11-13). The emphasis is on the functions of inmate culture in coping with deprivations indigenous to the prison. Hence, such a view has been referred to variably as a "functional," "deprivation," "situational," or "indigenous origin" model of prisonization.[1]

The tendency to concentrate heavily on conditions within the prison when explaining inmate prespectives has generated considerable criticism. For example, Irwin and Cressey (1964:225-245) contend that "functional" or "indigenous origin" perspectives have overemphasized situational factors within the prison and "overlooked the dramatic effect that external behavior patterns have on the conduct of inmates in any given prison." Similarly, Gibbons (1968:467-474) takes the position that "the prison life which emerges among inmates is significantly influenced by characteristics which these individuals import into the institution." Moreover, such arguments have been supported by recent research on males. Schwartz's (1971:532-542) study of "pre-institutional" versus "situational" influences in a correctional community, Wheeler's (1971:1005-1022) analysis of social organization in Scandanavian prisons and Thomas and Foster's (1972:229-230) partial test of "importation" and "deprivation" models of prisonization all support the notion that situational variables cannot fully explain prisonization.

Actually, one of the major sources of support for the importance of characteristics imported into the system has been research on women in prison. In her study of a "society of women" (1966:187) Giallombardo

suggests that "general features of American society with respect to the cultural definition and content of male and female roles are brought into the prison setting and function to determine the direction and focus of the inmate cultural systems." Sex appears to be an "imported" characteristic affecting both formal and informal prison social organization. On the other hand, we know relatively little concerning the impact of other imported characteristics and background variables reflecting other "general features" of American society. A major aim of the present research is to examine the relative "impact" of certain background variables as compared to situational variables on inmate perspectives and, thus, to assess the merits of diffusionist and situational models among women in prison.

Moreover, there have been inconsistencies in prisonization research involving certain central situational variables among both men and women in prison and in the attempt to reconcile divergent findings researchers have focused on both the characteristics of institutions and characteristics of inmate populations. However, such analyses have been largely exploratory and rarely has there been any attempt to draw on general theoretical perspectives in the specification of traditional models. This analysis attempts to move in such a direction by drawing on emerging notions of "retributive justice" reflected in the writings of Edwin Lemert (1967) David Matza (1964:103-179) and others who focus on norms and expectations concerning "just" responses to law-breaking. "Justice" as a concept has received considerable philosophical attention and, in more recent years, has been a topic of considerable experimental research. However, while central to discussions of the law and the application of punishment the social scientific focus has been on justice in the

distribution of rewards and the consequences of "inequity" in the distribution of rewards (e.g. Adams 1965; Homans 1961; Selznick 1969). There has been little theoretical and even less empirical attention devoted to norms concerning the just distribution of punishment or the consequences of inequitable punishment.

What little analysis there has been seems highly relevant for prisonization research. The applicability of typical situational models may depend on cultural and subcultural norms and expectations concerning responses to law-breaking. For example, in his recent research on Scandanavian prisons Wheeler (1971:1005-1022) could find no evidence supporting traditional models of inmate culture and prisonization. He suggests this departure from commonly cited patterns in American prisons may reflect cultural differences in definitions of deprivation and appropriate responses to law-breaking. What we are suggesting is that the impact of the prison experience in American society may be contingent on such norms and expectations as well. Lemert (1967:42-43) suggests that labeling is most likely to enhance commitment to deviant values when there are inconsistencies or disparities between the punishment and the deviant actions toward which it is directed. Similarly, Matza (1964: 103-179) argues that the violation of commonly held expectations regarding adjudication gives rise to a "sense of injustice" which further attenuates the moral bind of the law. Thus, we might anticipate that to the degree that there is variable consensus concerning the impropriety of different "criminal" acts and variation in expected and appropriate responses to different types of behavior, imprisonment should be defined as a more "appropriate," "just" or "expected" response for some acts, situations and offenders than for others. In turn, traditional situational models

should be more applicable for some categories of inmates than for others. Specifically, the less appropriate, expected or equitable imprisonment is as a response to law-breaking the greater the applicability of the situational model.

The Population, Setting and Sample

The anlysis to follow is based on data gathered from female felons and misdemeanants imprisoned in a correctional center for women in the southeastern United States. It is a minimum security institution and the only women's prison in the state where the study was conducted. The institution provides a number of programs aimed at "rehabilitation" including academic and vocational education, study release and community volunteer programs. Participation in certain educational programs is required for inmates who are under 16 or who have not completed the fourth grade. Participation in other programs requires permission and/or qualification. In addition, each inmate is given a job assignment to one of a variety of traditionally "female" type activities such as laundress, seamstress, cook, waitress or beautician. The stated policy on job assignments gives precedence to the prison's needs although staff indicate that an attempt is made to consider the inmates preferences when possible.

The institution lists a population of 304. However, when those inmates housed in halfway houses elsewhere in the state, those no longer in the institution and those who had participated in a pretest were eliminated, the available population was considerably reduced. Data were ultimately obtained from a random sample of 175 (82 percent of those available). Since some data on all listed inmates were available through

official records, we were able to assess the representativeness of the final sample on a limited set of characteristics. The differences between the total population and the final sample appear slight: (1) Sixty-four percent of the inmates in the present study are black as compared to 65 percent listed in official records. (2) Sixty-four percent were felons according to records as compared to 61 percent in our sample. (3) Official records indicate that 27 percent had completed the twelfth grade as compared to 24 percent of the sample. (4) The mean age of the sample was 28 as compared to 27 in the official records. (5) Four percent of the sample indicate having tried to escape and official records indicate an identical percentage. In sum, at least in terms of those characteristics the sample appears to be representative of the total inmate population listed by the institution.

The measures used in this research are based on responses to questionnaire items. Each inmate filled out a questionnaire designed to deal with those issues which have dominated prisonization research among male inmates. On the basis of an earlier study of the women's prison and a pretest we concluded that we should vary the administration of the questionnaire depending on reading ability of the inmates. Thus some inmates completed the questionnaire in groups of 25 and others in groups of two to six. Those who had a great difficulty understanding the questionnaire were either read the items and allowed to indicate their responses on separate cards or were interviewed individually. Moreover, the questionnaire was administered in private rooms with no correctional personnel allowed. Inmates were guaranteed anonymity and instructed not to communicate or sit close to one another. At the end of a session each inmate received a token remuneration of $1.00 for cooperating in the study.

The dependent variable in the present analysis is similar to that examined by Wheeler (1961:697-712), Tittle (1969:492-505), Ward and Kassenbaum (1965:30-55), Schwartz (1971:532-542) and others and has been referred to variably as "subscription," "embracement" or "commitment" to an "inmate code." As delineated in the literature such a code consists of five maxims (Cressey 1969:174-175): (1) Do not divulge information, (2) Do not respect the staff, (3) Do not weaken, submit or accept, (4) Refrain from quarrels with other inmates and (5) Do not exploit fellow inmates. Since the latter two maxims are generally consistent with official norms and expectations (Cloward 1960:20-48) we limited our measure to items reflecting conflict with authority and organizational expectations at the correctional center. The final measure used in the present analysis was based on responses to four items selected on the basis of a factor analysis: (1) "The officers here deserve respect because they are only doing their job," (2) "If an inmate knows that another inmate is planning to escape, she should tell an officer," (3) "Inmates should tell the staff when somebody breaks the rules," and (4) "I enjoy taking part in the activities that go on around here." These items were standardized, weighted and added to form an index of "subscription to the inmate code." For the tabular analysis the index was dichotomized at the mean with approximately fifty percent of the inmates falling in the "high" category and fifty percent in the "low" category. A nine point scale was used when conducting multiple correlation and regression analyses.

Findings

Traditional Situational Variables

Functional theories of prisonization have focused on experiences during confinement but particularly on processes thought to reflect

time spent in the institution and temporal isolation from the outside world. While the original focus was on time served in the institution early research by Wheeler (1961:697-712) led to a conceptual reformulation combining time served with time remaining to reflect an inmate's "institutional career phase." Inmates in the "middle" of their institutional careers are viewed as more isolated from the non-prison world than those early or late in their careers. While such a pattern is widely cited in research, it is by no means universal (see Atchley and McCabe 1968:774-785). In fact, of the two studies examining career phase among female inmates only Tittle (1969:502) reports such a pattern. Ward and Kassenbaum (1965:42-43) could find no evidence of a U-shaped relation nor any significant relations involving time served or remaining.

Our findings are fairly similar to Tittle's analysis. Using several different procedures for examining the relationship between career

(Table 1 here)

phase and embracement of the inmate code, the data consistently suggested the traditional pattern with embracement highest for the synthetic cohort[2] of "middle phase" inmates. Since the procedure used by Tittle and the second procedure summarized in Table 1 could result in a disproportionate number of long term inmates in the middle phase we felt it particularly important to examine certain "key categories" which seemed to clearly represent each of the career phase cohorts. While the number of inmates in such categories was small, the pattern of findings was quite similar to that noted for the larger sample. Middle phase inmates are more likely to embrace views contrary to official expectations than inmates in the early or late phases of their institutional careers. We should note, however, that the differences using our data were statistically

insignificant (chi-square) for all three procedures and that computations using Tittle's data show his differences to be statistically insignificant as well. Thus, while the two studies seem to suggest similar patterns the relationship is not particularly impressive.

Other Situational Variables

In Table 2 we have summarized the relationships involving a wide range of additional situational variables including contact with outside friends and relatives, contact with staff, participation in special programs and inmate interaction as well as the coefficients relating temporal variables to inmate perspectives. In general, we would have to

(Table 2 here)

conclude that contact with friends and relatives, relationships with the staff and participation in special programs make little or no difference for inmate perspectives. In fact, when group contact and career phase are entered into a multiple correlation analysis together with frequency of contacts with treatment staff, letters sent and received and emotional support from friends and relatives, those two "explain" about six percent of the variance while the others collectively explain only two percent. In sum, while situational variables do not make much difference for inmate perspectives, those variables most central to previous situational research did turn out to be the most strongly related to subscription to the inmate code.

Diffusionist Variables

As noted earlier, several theorists have argued that characteristics imported into the prison are related to variable embracement of the inmate code and recent analysis of diffusionist perspectives among males in

prison (Schwartz 1971:532-542; Thomas and Foster 1972:229-239) have, in fact, supported such arguments. In our analysis we focused on several "general features" of a person's social position in the outside world as well as certain basic offense characteristics. As summarized in Table 3, three of the background variables and one of the legal status variables

(Table 3 here)

are fairly strongly related to embracement of the inmate code. Younger inmates, educated inmates and inmates with urban backgrounds are more hostile towards the institution and its staff than older, less educated, non-urban inmates. Similarly, felons appear to be more hostile than misdemeanants. Race, previous prison experience and the violent-nonviolent offense dichotomy made virtually no difference for embracement of the inmate code among these female inmates.

Since such background variables are interrelated we carried out a multiple regression analysis to gain some idea of the independent impact of each and the amount of variance "explained" by the entire set. While the zero order correlation coefficients for age, education, urban and felony status were -.38, +.22, +.20 and +.26, respectively, the standardized regression coefficients for the same variables were -.31, +.06, +.11 and +.18. It appears that the correlation between educational status and inmate orientations may have been partially "spurious" through its association with age and partially indirect through its association with felony status. Collectively these four variables accounted for slightly over twenty percent of the variance in inmate perspectives (R=.45). When the same four background variables are introduced together with the two situational variables (career phase and group contact) the six variables collectively account for close to one-fourth of the variance in embracement of

the inmate code (see Table 4). Both situational and background variables make some difference for inmate persepctives but of the six only

(Table 4 here)

the coefficients for age and felony status were statistically significant at the .05 level. Urban status and education are more weakly related than the two situational variables.

The most strongly and persistently related background variable among our female inmates was age and it appears to have had an impact on attitudes towards the staff and institution which cannot be attributed to its association with other background or situational variables. This finding is quite consistent with research among males in that age has been cited as one of the most significant correlates of behavior within prison and recidivism after release (e.g. Wolfgang 1964:21-35; Glaser 1964:36; Glueck and Glueck 1937:105). In fact Marvin Wolfgang (1964:36) found age to be the most significant correlate of his measure of "adjustment to prison" among males incarcerated for homicide. The fact that older inmates are more likely to accord respect to institutional staff, express verbal agreement with system rules and enjoy the activities offered in the prison is particularly interesting in view of the widespread belief that young offenders should be separated from older offenders for the protection of the young. The age difference in embracement of anti-institutional views is paralleled by similar age patterns for rule-breaking and punishment in prison. Younger inmates are more likely than older inmates to report violations of prison rules (-.33) and to report having been punished by staff (-.42). In sum, age, like sex, appears to be one of those general features of American society which has consequences for inmate behavior, reactions to behavior and normative orientation towards the prison and its staff.

Specification

We mentioned earlier that there are inconsistencies in research concerning situational variables and prisonization among both males and females. Atchley and McCabe (1968:774-785) report that their research "was able to sustain neither Clemmer's nor Wheeler's theories concerning the development of prisonization." They, and others, have suggested a number of possibilities which might specify the conditions under which the situational prisonization model may be most applicable. As Garrity (1961) notes, the most commonly advanced model seems most relevant to maximum security institutions and least adequate for "minimum security" or "open" institutions. Similarly, Atchley and McCabe (1968:788) cite Street, et al. (1966:212) to the effect that traditional models may be limited to institutions oriented towards "obedience" or "treatment" rather than "re-education and development." In fact, it does appear that the correctional center we studied requires a far more complete deprivation of personal possessions and greater role dispossession (Goffman 1961) than the institution studied by Ward and Kassenbaum. However, Tittle's analysis was based on a federal institution consisting of both voluntarily as well as involuntarily incarcerated narcotic addicts which allowed supervised interaction among males and females and considerable freedom of choice within the institution. Hence, we might be able to reconcile our results with Ward and Kassenbaum's by focusing on characteristics of the institution, but at least based on descriptions of the institutions, such a comparison does not seem to account for Tittle's findings.

Atchley and McCabe also raise the possibility that differences in the nature of the inmate populations studied may make a difference for

patterns of prisonization such that the situational model may be more applicable to some inmate populations than to others. We attempted to explore such possibilities by examining the relationships between the two most common situational variables and embracement of the inmate code among variable categories of inmates. We were particularly interested in the variable degree of association between career phase and inmate perspectives among inmates imprisoned for different types of crime. While we had no data on conceptions of appropriate and inappropriate responses to various types of crime it seemed plausible to hypothesize that consensus concerning the propriety of imprisonment should be higher for crimes of violence than for crimes against property or "victimless" crimes. Similarly, imprisonment should be viewed as a more appropriate or just response to a felony than a misdemeanor. Thus, labeling theoretical notions concerning retributive justice seemed to imply that the traditional prisonization argument should be most applicable to misdemeanants and "victimless" offenders and least applicable to felons and violent offenders.

Table 5 summarizes the appropriate gamma coefficients. The data do seem to suggest that both career phase and group contact are most strongly related to embracement of the inmate code among misdemeanants and victimless offenders. In fact, while there were too few cases to

(Tables 5 and 6 here)

have much confidence in the outcome of further subdivisions, the results were essentially consistent with retributive justice hypotheses even when inmates were categorized on both felony status and offense simultaneously (see Table 6). Career phase was significantly related to subscription to the inmate code only among misdemeanants and then only for property

and victimless offenders. Group contact was significantly related only for "victimless" misdemeanants. Moreover, while the order is not perfect the relationships do tend to vary in the predicted direction when moving from the victimless-misdemeanant to the violent-felon category.

When inmates were subdivided on the basis of other background characteristics the only comparable variation occurred for racial status (Table 7). Career phase is virtually unrelated to embracement of the inmate code among Blacks and group contact was far more weakly related

(Table 7 here)

than among Whites. There is obviously variation in the magnitude of relationships for other subcategories but none comparable to the patterns noted for felony status, type of offense and race. While we did not predict the variation by race, we can at least suggest its possible relevance to notions of retributive justice.

Variation in prisonization among socio-demographic groups may reflect variation in norms or expectations concerning punishment. It may be that imprisonment is viewed as a more appropriate response or, at least, a more "expected" response to law-breaking among southern Black women than southern White women. Imprisonment is a rare response to female law-breaking and is particularly rare for White females. Thus, such a reaction to law-breaking may be a greater violation of standards of retributive justice in the eyes of White females than Black females. We should also note that the variation in traditional patterns by type of offense and legal status seems to persist even within racial subcategories (see Table 8). In seven of eight comparisons the situational

(Table 8 here)

variables are more strongly related to inmate perspectives in the pre-

dicted categories. The differences are quite prominent in six of those comparisons. Thus, while the number of cases in most cells is again limited, the pattern suggested by notions of retributive justice tends to emerge even when further controls are implemented.

Summary and Observations

This study has attempted to build upon and extend prisonization analysis by examining three interrelated issues: (1) the relationship of traditional "situational" variables to inmate perspectives among women in prison, (2) the relative impact of "diffusionist" and "situational" variables on inmate perspectives and (3) the possible relevance of general notions of retributive justice to the specification of traditional models of prisonization. In dealing with the first of these issues we were partially replicating the two earlier analyses of prisonization among female inmates. In dealing with the second we were extending prisonization analysis among women in a direction exemplified in recent research among men. And, finally, by attempting to specify the traditional model we hoped to suggest new lines of theoretical inquiry and to relate prisonization theory to more general speculation on retributive justice.

Our findings concerning the two traditional situational variables, career phase and group contact, were quite consistent with the bulk of prisonization research among males and the most recent analysis among females. Embracement of an inmate code appears greatest for the synthetic cohort of inmates in the "middle" of their institutional careers and is positively associated with group contact with other inmates. However, the relationships were weak and career phase was not significantly related to inmate perspectives. On the other hand, they were more strongly

related than other situational variables including relationships with staff and outsiders and participation in special treatment programs. Moreover, we were also able to observe that relationsips involving career phase and group contact were far stronger in some categories of inmates than others and that while the relationships varied they were remarkably persistent. Career phase was positively related to embracement of the inmate code in 20 of 23 subcategories examined, and group contact was positively related in all but one subcategory. Thus, while the relationships are weak they are quite persistent and consistent in both magnitude and direction with Tittle's research.

Our analysis of the relative association of "situational" as compared to "imported" variables was fairly consistent with previous speculation and research as well. Background variables were more strongly related to inmate perspectives than situational variables and collectively accounted for about twenty percent of the variances. When combined with career phase and group contact the entire set accounted for about twenty-five percent of the variance. Only age and felony status were significantly related. Age persisted as the strongest correlate of inmate perspectives and its impact would not be attributed to any of the other variables examined. Older inmates are less hostile toward the system and less likely to violate prison rules than are younger inmates. In sum, the data do support critiques of the functionalist approach to the effect that characteristics imported into the prison shape inmate behavior and normative orientations. Background characteristics such as age appear to make for greater differences in inmate perspectives than do experiences, interaction and temporal isolation within the prison context.

The analysis relevant to retributive justice is highly speculative

and variation in the magnitude of traditional relationships within offense, legal status and racial categories might be due to chance or explained in other ways. We were only able to hypothesize that the interaction noted might reflect variable norms and expectations concerning retributive justice. However, even though the interpretation goes well beyond the data, notions of retributive justice seem to add something new to the on-going discussion of prisonization. It has been widely argued that imprisonment may have different consequences for different "types" of offenders and that inconsistencies in prisonization research may reflect this fact. On the other hand, speculation on the issue tends to be fairly atheoretical. We are never told <u>why</u> different "types" should respond differently. Are differential responses a reflection of personality characteristics, variable norms and expectations concerning reactions to deviance, or some other aspect of the social context? Labeling theorists suggest that the consequences of reactions to deviance are contingent on the "fit" between such reactions and norms of retributive justice. Such a perspective does, at least, suggest new theoretical directions for prisonization research and raises a whole set of interrelated questions which might define the subject matter of a sociology of retributive justice: What notions do people hold concerning the "appropriate" response to certain forms of crime? How are such conceptions distributed among various socio-demographic categories? What are the consequences of violating such norms and expectations for the punished, punishers and audience?

Each of these questions has been dealt with by social scientists in the study of "distributive justice" but the focus has been almost entirely on the distribution of <u>rewards</u>. Homans (1961) Jaques (1961,

1967) and Selznick (1969) among others have all been concerned with the discovery of "rules of justice," shared social norms defining "fair" or "equitable" payment or conceptions of "fairness." Distributive justice is defined in terms of the relation between rewards and investments, outcomes and inputs (Adams 1965:272-283). Similarly, Anderson, Berger, Zelditch and Cohen (1969:1-16) emphasize "positively valued" characteristics, norms surrounding positively-valued goal-objects and the fit between positively valued characteristics and goal-objects in their discourse on equity and distributive justice. Studies of "reactions to inequity" have dealt exclusively with the cognitive, emotional and behavioral consequences of inequitable payment or inequitable reward structures. Thus, while the concept of justice has always been associated with the distribution of punishment sociological theory and research has concentrated on norms surrounding the distribution of rewards and the consequences of violating those norms.

Substantively, the study of justice should encompass the distribution of punishment. As Schrag (1969:14-15) argues "Justice. . .concerns the entire mechanism by which rewards and penalties of all kinds are distributed among the system's members, the norms that govern the distribution process, the way these norms are implemented in practice, and the degree of correspondence between norms and practices." There are a few studies concerning the public's "sense of justice" in law enforcement (e.g. Makels 1966:42-67; Kutschinsky 1966:21-41) and the degree of punishment people define as appropriate for certain crimes (Rose and Prell, 1955:247-259; Gibbons 1968:32-35). However, we know virtually nothing about the consequences of failures of retributive justice. As we have noted, Lemert (1967) and Matza (1964:101-180) have both advanced

hypotheses concerning the consequences of violation of such norms but these notions have yet to receive much attention in actual research. Thus, we hope that the present inquiry not only can add to our body of knowledge concerning prisonization and women in prison but that it suggests some new lines of inquiry and theoretical integration in the study reactions to deviance and retributive justice.

FOOTNOTES

[1]"Prisonization" was originally delineated by Donald Clemmer (1940: 299) as "the taking on, in greater or lesser degree, of the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary." The original emphasis was on the "taking on" or assimilation of an inmate code over time in the institution. However, the concept is also widely used to refer to the degree to which an inmate embraces certain attitudes towards the institution, its staff and other inmates regardless of the source of that variation. For example in summarizing his earlier research, Wheeler (1971:1006) states that "An attitude measure of attitudinal conformity versus non-conformity to the values of the staff. . .was developed to serve as an empirical indicator reflecting Clemmer's concept of prisonization." However, in the strictest sense prisonization does not refer to a set of attitudes but the taking on of a set of attitudes as a result of the prison experience. The present study examines correlates of attitudinal conformity to the values of staff but treats "prisonization" as an hypothesis central to functional theories rather than as a dependent variable. The existence of certain relationships between inmate attitudes and situational variables is indicative of prisonization--not the attitudes themselves.

[2]These data were gathered at one point in time and follow the same basic procedures in defining career phase cohorts as earlier studies of prisonization. However, one problem in replicating and integrating previous research on career phase is the lack of any clear rationale for differentiating the cohorts. For example, in Tittle's analysis early phase inmates are those who have served less than four months and have more than two remaining. Middle phase inmates have served

more than four and have more than two remaining. Late phase inmates have served less than one and have less than two remaining. Given the cutting points for early and middle phase inmates we would have expected late phase inmates to be those who have served more than four and have less than two months remaining. The change in cutting points creates a situation where late phase inmates may have shorter terms. In our analysis we experimented with several procedures and report the results of each. Moreover, we eliminated inmates with short terms from the measure of career phase since they did not clearly belong in any of the career phase categories and used constant cutting points in creating the three categories. Since Ward and Kassenbaum (1965) do not present the data relevant to their measure of career phase it is possible that variations in the procedures used to measure career phase could lead to inconsistent findings.

TABLE 1

PERCENT SUBSCRIBING TO INMATE CODE
BY CAREER PHASE
(THREE PROCEDURES AND TITTLE'S STUDY)

Procedure		1: Ratio[a]	2: Months[b]	Key Categories[c]	Tittle's Study[d]
Career Phase	Early	45%(53)	38%(37)	50%(10)	50%(24)
	Middle	62%(48)	60%(78)	65%(25)	64%(36)
	Late	55%(40)	58%(26)	39%(18)	50%(30)

[a]Categories created by taking the ratio of time served (trichotomized) to time remaining (trichotomized).

[b]Early = less than 4 served, more than 3 remaining;
Middle = more than 4 served, more than 3 remaining;
Late = more than 4 served, less than 3 remaining.

[c]Early = less than 4 served, more than 13 remaining;
Middle = more than 4 served, 4 to 12 remaining;
Late = more than 9 served, less than 4 remaining.

[d]Early = less than 4 served, more than 2 remaining;
Middle = more than 4 served, more than 2 remaining;
Late = less than 1 served, less than 2 remaining.

TABLE 2

INMATE CODE BY SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

	Gamma	(Tau C)
Contact with Outsiders		
Letters Received	+.11	(+.08)
Letters Sent	-.14	(-.04)
Visits	+.08	(+.06)
Different Visitors	+.08	(+.06)
Emotional Support[a]	+.12	(+.08)
Contact with Staff		
Staff Friends[b]	-.09	(-.06)
Contact with Treatment Staff	+.13	(+.10)
Participation in Special Programs[c]	+.09	(+.04)
Interaction with Inmates		
Group Contact[d]	+.35	(+.26)
Inmate Friends	+.15	(+.14)
Temporal Variables		
Career Phase[e]	+.24	(+.18)
Time Served[f]	+.28	(+.19)
Time Remaining[g]	+.11	(+.08)

[a]Based on the item "Do you feel you can depend on friends and relatives outside the prison for help and support when you really need it?"

[b]Based on the item "Have you developed any strong friendships with other inmates since you have been in the institution?"

[c]Includes work release, study release, basic education or vocational education.

[d]Based on Wheeler's items (1961: Footnote 17).

[e]Based on time served (trichotomy) in relation to time remaining (trichotomy). See "a," Table 1. Categories were ordered with middle phase last and early phase first since the underlying ordinal variable is temporal isolation from the outside world.

[f]Trichotomized: Less than or equal to three months, four to nine months, ten or more months.

[g]Trichotomized: Less than or equal to three months, four to twelve months, thirteen or more months.

TABLE 3

INMATE CODE BY PRE-IMPRISONMENT VARIABLES

	Gamma	(Tau C)
Basic Background		
Race[a]	-.06	(-.03)
Age[b]	-.54	(-.38)
Education[c]	+.44	(+.31)
Urban Experience[d]	+.43	(+.27)
Legal Status		
Felon-Misdemeanant[e]	+.51	(+.26)
Violent-Nonviolent[f]	-.03	(-.01)
Previous Imprisonment[g]	+.07	(+.04)

[a]Dichotomy: (1) White, (2) Black.

[b]Trichotomized: (1) 22 or younger, (2) 23 through 29, (3) 30 or older.

[c]Eight categories ranging from zero to sixteen years.

[d]Dichotomy: (1) Urban, (2) Small town, rural.

[e]Dichotomy: (1) Felon, (2) Misdemeanant.

[f]Dichotomy: (1) Murder, assault, (2) Other.

[g]Five categories ranging from zero to two years previous imprisonment.

TABLE 4

INMATE CODE BY SITUATIONAL AND DIFFUSIONIST VARIABLES[a]
(CORRELATION AND STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS)

		r	beta	
Situational Variables	Career Phase	+.20	+.14	
	Group Contact	+.17	+.10	
Diffusionist Variables	Age	-.38	-.29[b]	
	Felony Status	+.26	+.18[b]	
	Urban Status	+.20	-.09	
	Education	+.22	+.08	$R^2 = .24$[b]

[a]The dependent variable was entered in the form of a nine point scale. Age and education were entered in terms of number of years. Group contact, urban status and felony status were entered as dummy variables with values of "0" and "1." Career phase was entered with values of "0" for "early," "1" for "late" and "2" for "middle phase" inmates.

[b]Statistically significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5

INMATE CODE BY CAREER PHASE AND GROUP CONTACT BY LEGAL STATUS AND TYPE OF OFFENSE
(Gamma and Percentage Difference)

Legal Status:	Felon	Misdemeanant	Offense:[a]	Violent	Property	Victimless
Career Phase						
	+.04	+.81		+.12	+.31	+.44
%d[b]	2%	62%		8%	20%	35%
N=	(101)	(39)		(46)	(56)	(32)
Group Contact						
	+.24	+.66		+.12	+.17	+.67
%d	11%	33%		5%	16%	36%
N=	(102)	(64)		(49)	(51)	(43)

[a]Violent = Murder, assault; Property = Theft, embezzlement, forgery, white collar; Victimless = Narcotics, disorderly, drunk, alcohol, motor vehicle.

[b]The difference reported is between "early" and "middle" phase inmates.

TABLE 6

SUBSCRIPTION TO INMATE CODE BY CAREER PHASE
AND GROUP CONTACT BY OFFENSE CATEGORIES
(Gamma Coefficients)

Offense Categories	Career Phase[b]	(N=)	Group Contact	(N=)
Misdemeanor (+.81)				
Violent	.00	(8)	+.71	(10)
Property	+1.00[a]	(14)	+.44	(26)
Victimless	+1.00[a]	(10)	+1.00[a]	(16)
Felon (+.04)				
Violent	+.16	(37)	-.05	(37)
Property	-.06	(42)	+.37	(42)
Victimless	-.06	(18)	+.38	(19)

[a]Despite the extremely small number of cases in these categories chi-squares within these categories were statistically significant at the .05 level.

[b]The results were basically similar with short termers in the analysis. Gamma was -.50, +.33 and +1.00 for the offense categories among misdemeanants and +.16, -.06 and +.23 among felons.

TABLE 7

SUBSCRIPTION TO INMATE CODE BY CAREER PHASE AND GROUP CONTACT BY BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(Gamma Coefficients)

Control Variable		Career Phase[a]	(N=)	Group Contact[b]	(N=)
Race	Black	+.08	(92)	+.22	(108)
	White	+.40	(43)	+.60	(56)
Age	Under 22	+.16	(44)	+.30	(55)
	22-29	+.30	(50)	+.35	(59)
	Over 29	+.17	(47)	+.47	(57)
Urban Status	Urban	+.26	(79)	+.20	(88)
	Non-urban	+.18	(60)	+.48	(78)
Prior Prison	Yes	+.28	(84)	+.27	(105)
	No	+.25	(54)	+.38	(64)
Education	Jr. High or Less	+.34	(42)	+.46	(50)
	Some High School	+.27	(64)	+.31	(77)
	High School or More	+.22	(32)	+.27	(39)

[a] Three categories ordered in terms of underlying theoretical dimension of isolation from non-prison world (Early, Late, Middle). "Short termers" not included.

[b] Dichotomized identically to Wheeler's study (1961:footnote 17).

TABLE 8

SUBSCRIPTION TO INMATE CODE BY CAREER PHASE
AND GROUP CONTACT BY RACE AND OFFENSE
(Gamma Coefficients)

Race and Offense Categories	Career Phase	(N=)	Group Contact	(N=)
Black				
Misdemeanant	+.78	(26)	+.78	(40)
Felon	-.16	(65)	-.00	(65)
Violent	+.09	(38)	+.13	(40)
Property	+.32	(30)	+.11	(37)
Victimless	-.10	(19)	+.55	(22)
White				
Misdemeanant	+1.00	(12)	+.60	(23)
Felon	+.22	(31)	+.58	(31)
Violent	+.00	(7)	+.00	(8)
Property	+.21	(24)	+.48	(30)
Victimless	+1.00	(7)	+1.00	(11)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. S.
1965 "Inequity in social exchange." Pp. 267-299 in L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press

Anderson, Bo, Joseph Berger, Morris Zelditch, Jr. and Bernard P. Cohen
1969 "Reactions to inequity." Acta Sociologica 12 (Number 1): 1-16.

Atchley, Robert C. and M. Patrick McCabe
1968 "Socialization in correctional communities: a replication." American Sociological Review 33 (October): 774-785.

Clemmer, Donald
1940 The Prison Community. New York: Rinehart and Co.

Cloward, Richard A.
1960 "Social control in the prison." Pp. 20-48 in Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Social Science Research Council Pamphlet #15.

Cressey, Donald R.
1969 Theft of the Nation: The Structure and Operations of Organized Crime in America. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Giallombardo, Rose
1966 Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Gibbons, Don C.
1968 Society, Crime and Criminal Careers. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Glaser, Daniel
1965 The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck
1937 Later criminal careers. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.

Goffman, Erving
1961 Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Homans, George Casper
1961 Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Irwin, John and Donald R. Cressey
1962 "Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture." Social Problems 10 (Fall):142-155.

Jaques, Elliott
1967 Equitable Payment: A General Theory of Work, Differential Payment and Industrial Progress. Harmondswworth, Middlesex, England: Penquin Books Ltd.

Kutschinsky, Berl
1966 "Law and education. Some aspects of the Scandanavian studies into 'the general sense of justice'." Acta Sociologica 10 (Fasc. 1-2):21-41.

Lemert, Edwin
1967 Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Makela, Klaus
1966 "Public sense of justice and judicial practice." Acta Sociologica 10 (Fasc.1-2):42-67.

Matza, David
1964 Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Rose, Arnold M. and Arthur E. Prell
1955 "Does the punishment fit the crime? A study in social valuation." American Journal of Sociology 61 (November):247-259.

Schrag, Clarence
1969 "The correctional system: problems and prospects." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 381 (January):11-20.

Schwartz, Barry
1971 "Pre-institutional vs. situational influence in a correctional community." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 62 (December):532-542.

Selznick, Philip with the collaboration of Philippe Nonet and Howard M. Vollmer
1969 Law, Society and Industrial Justice. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Street, David, Robert D. Vitner, and Charles Perrow
1966 Organization for Treatment. New York: The Free Press.

Sykes, Gresham M.
1958 The Society of Captives. New York: Atheneum.

Sykes, Gresham M. and Sheldon L. Messinger
1960 "The inmate social system." in Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. Social Science Research Council Pamphlet No. 15 (March):5-19.

Thomas, Charles W. and Samuel C. Foster
1972 "Prisonization in the inmate contraculture." Social Problems 20 (Fall):229-239.